



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/598,062	06/20/2000	Carolyn Petersen	480.75-2 (HV)	6515

7590

10/22/2002

Hana Verny
Peters Verny Jones & Biska L L P
385 Sherman Avenue Suite 6
Palo Alto, CA 94306-1840

EXAMINER

GUCKER, STEPHEN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1647

DATE MAILED: 10/22/2002

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/598,62

Applicant(s)

Peterson et al.

Examiner

Stephen J. Guck

Group Art Unit

1647

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/29/02
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 19-25 + 40-49 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 19-25 + 40-49 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1 7.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☒ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 1647

DETAILED ACTION

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Any objections or rejections made in a previous Office Action that are not herein reinstated have been withdrawn.
3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

4. Claims 19-24 and 40-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Nesterenko et al. ("Nesterenko"). Nesterenko discloses antibodies that bind to a surface antigen

Art Unit: 1647

proteinase of 24 kD associated with sporozites of *Cryptosporidium parvum* from fecal specimens (abstract and page 77). This surface antigen protease was inhibited by inhibitors of both metalloproteinases and thiol proteinases, but not serine or aspartyl proteinase inhibitors (page 85). The sensitivity of the membrane-associated cysteine protease to inhibitors is similar to that of the metallo-activated cysteine proteinases calpain I and II (page 86). Therefore, the evidence seems to suggest that Nesterenko's cysteine protease is the same antigen that comprises SEQ ID NOs: 4-6 of the instant Application, and antibodies to this antigen inherently meet the limitations of the instant claims (see page 79 and page 81 also for antibody-antigen complex formations; page 78 for radioactive labeling) given the evidence at hand and absent evidence to the contrary.

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.


6. Claims 19-22 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nesterenko in view of Ramakrishnan et al. ("US 5,817,310, "Ramakrishnan"). The teachings of Nesterenko are set forth above. Nesterenko does not teach monoclonal antibodies. Ramakrishnan does teach the advantage of monoclonal antibodies (column 9, lines 33-46; column 12, lines 1 to column 13, line 65) which can be produced from immortalized cell lines which would then allow unlimited production of antibodies. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

Art Unit: 1647

at the time of the invention to make monoclonal antibodies to any pathogen in order that the supply of said antibodies would be steady and constant from an immortalized cell line.

7. No claim is allowed.
8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen Gucker whose telephone number is (703) 308-6571. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 0930 to 1800. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Kunz, can be reached on (703) 308-4623. The fax phone number for this Group is currently (703) 308-4242, but Applicant should confirm this by phoning the Examiner before faxing.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.


Stephen Gucker
October 21, 2002

